

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 remain pending in the application.

Allowed Claims 7-14

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowance of claims 7-14.

Claims 1-6 over Ziegler in view of Mauney

In the Office Action, claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Pat. No. 6,718,395 to Ziegler (“Ziegler”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,484,027 to Mauney et al. (“Mauney”). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Examiner explains the analysis as to why claims 7-14 are allowable at page 4 of the Office Action. In particular, the Examiner explains that “it is neither taught nor suggested by the prior art to send a PIN or passcode in a general or limited inquiry for the purposes of matching said PIN to retrieve the BR_ADDR.” Rather, the Examiner explains, “the BLUETOOTH standards include means for matching PINs in two devices, but such a pairing or bonding action occurs after an inquiry provides the BR_ADDR to the inquiring device.”

To emphasize the Examiner’s thoughts that the prior art fails to teach use of a PIN to retrieve such a unique address BEFORE the BR_ADDR is provided to the inquiring device, claims 1-6 are amended herein to recite a unique address retrieval module that uses a passcode or PIN to retrieve a unique address from at least one other wireless piconet network device.

It is believed that with these changes to claims 1-6, that the Examiner would agree that claims 1-6 are allowable.

In detail, Ziegler discloses a user entering a 48 bit IEEE address identification of a master device into an analyzer (col. 6, lines 34-36). Ziegler relies on the same 48 bit IEEE address identification that Applicants disclose in the Background of the Invention potentially causes problems with a device entering a Bluetooth network. It appears that the Examiner would agree that

Ziegler fails to disclose, teach or suggest a passcode or PIN that is distinct from an IEEE address, as recited by claims 1-6.

However, the Office Action relies on a theoretical combination using Mauney to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Ziegler to arrive at the claimed invention. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Mauney discloses a wireless telephone handset that is able to communicate with other wireless telephone handset directly without relying on a cellular or PCS network (Abstract). The wireless telephone handset is able to determine with other wireless telephone handset users are located within a predetermined operating range (Mauney, Abstract). A List Maintenance feature allows a user to access other wireless telephone handset (Mauney, col. 16, lines 6-36). A Find feature allows a user to find other wireless telephone handsets within a range to perform a free call outside of a cellular or PCS network (Mauney, col. 29, lines 51-67).

Mauney discloses a wireless telephone that alternately can connect directly to a second wireless telephone. Mauney fails to disclose or suggest application of any of the disclosed features to a wireless piconet network device. In fact, use of a wireless piconet network device with Mauney's invention would make the invention practically useless. A wireless piconet network device, such as a BLUETOOTH device, is intended to communication over a relatively short distance. Modifying Mauney's invention with a piconet transceiver would only allow telephone communications over a relatively short distance, making the point of the invention moot. Mauney fails to disclose a piconet network device, much less disclose or suggest a passcode or PIN that is used to retrieve a unique address from at least one other wireless piconet network device, the passcode or PIN used to retrieve a unique address from at least one other wireless piconet network device, as recited by claims 1-6.

The Applicants disclose in the Background of the Invention, a BLUETOOTH device that desires to enter communications with other devices within range of a piconet and/or scatternet sends its 48-bit address to all the other devices. The unique 48-bit addresses of all other BLUETOOTH devices of all types are received, having the potential of increasing network traffic,

degrading communications in general, particularly in a fluent network design such as in mobile applications.

Neither Ziegler nor Mauney discloses, teaches or suggests a passcode or PIN that is used to retrieve a unique address from at least one other wireless piconet network device, the passcode or PIN used to retrieve a unique address from at least one other wireless piconet network device, as recited by claims 1-6.

For at least all the above reasons, claims 1-6 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Bollman
Reg. No. 36,457

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC

2000 M Street, NW 7th Floor
Washington, DC 20036-3307
TEL. (202) 261-1020
FAX. (202) 887-0336